hv

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/845,065	04/27/2001	Bernhard L. Convent	STL 920000073US2	1668

7590 06/02/2005	EXAMINER
David W. Victor	SIDDIQI, MOHAMMAD A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2154	

David W. Victor
KONRAD RAYNES & VICTOR LLP
315 S.Beverly Drive; Suite 210
Beverly Hills, CA 90212

DATE MAILED: 06/02/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	09/845,065	CONVENT ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Mohammad A. Siddiqi	2154	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>25 January 2005</u>.

2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) <u>1-42</u> is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) <u>1-42</u> is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:

      1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>03/14/2005</u>.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   Claims 1-42 are presented for examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35

U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in

this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

3.   Claims 1-11, 13-25, 27-39, and 41-42 are rejected under 35

U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Ireland et al. (6,266,666) (hereinafter

Ireland).

4.   As per claims 1, 15, and 29, Ireland discloses a method, system, and

article of manufacture for enabling access to data, comprising:

receiving a call from a client (210, fig 2) to invoke a remote

interface method (220, fig 2, col 4, lines 9-19);

accessing (220, fig 2, col 4, lines 1-3), with a remote interface

implementation (220, fig 2, col 3, lines 18-24), parameters from the

received call (col 6, lines 33-38) in response to the invocation of the

remote interface method (response is in the form of tabular result set,

col 8, lines 56-60);

generating a stored procedure call (col 9, lines 48-55) with the

accessed parameters as input parameters (class ParamDef, col 11) of the

stored procedure (col 9, lines 48-55 and col 10, lines 45-49);

transferring the stored procedure call to a stored procedure named by

the call to execute (col 9, lines 51-60);

receiving output from the stored procedure (output is tabular result

set, col 9, lines 47-51);

inserting the received output from the stored procedure into a data

object (result set is an object, col 9, lines 47-51); and

returning the data object to the client (210, fig 2, col 10, lines 7-10).

5.   As per claims 2, 16, and 30, Ireland discloses the stored procedure

executes in a database server (col 9, lines 47-51 and col 14, lines 39-40,

"exec " is a command to execute store procedure in the database) and

generates the output (col 9, lines 51-55, query is a method used to request

information from a database), wherein the output is capable of comprising

output that is a member of the set of output comprising one or more result

sets (col 9, lines 51-51) of data from the database table (col 5, lines 51–60)

and one or more output parameters resulting from stored procedure

operations (col 9, lines 47-52) performed on data in the database table (col

9, lines 47-51 and col 14, lines 39-40, "exec " is a command to execute

store procedure in the database).

6.   As per claims 3, 17, and 31, Ireland discloses processing, with the

remote interface implementation (220, fig 2, col 12, lines 54-59), an input

mapping (lookup in hash table, col 12, lines 8-26) to determine the

parameters (CmdMap, col 12, lines 64-67 and col 13, lines 1-30) in the

client call to use as input parameters to the stored procedure call (col 16,

lines 62-67).

7.   As per claims 4, 18, and 32, Ireland discloses receiving the stored

procedure output after the stored procedure program completes execution

(write data out, col 10, lines 29-35).

8.   As per claims 5, 19, and 33, Ireland discloses processing an output

mapping indicating how the stored procedure output is mapped to the data

object (tabular result set, col 10, lines 36-42).

9.   As per claims 6, 20, and 34, Ireland discloses the output is capable of

including result sets and parameters (col 9,lines 59-65), wherein the output

mapping indicates an order (JDBC result handle, col 4, lines 19-20) in which

the received result sets and parameters are added to the data object

(addParamDef and getParamDef, col 11 and col 12, lines 7-11).

10.   As per claims 7, 21, and 35, Ireland discloses generating metadata

describing the stored procedure output included in the data object (col 10,

lines 60-65); and

      adding the metadata to the data object (col 12, lines 7-11 and col 10,

lines 13-20).

11.   As per claims 8, 22, and 36, Ireland discloses processing, with the

client, the metadata in the received data object to determine how to access

the stored procedure output from the data object (col 12, lines 7-11 and col

10, lines 13-20).

12.   As per claims 9, 23, and 37, Ireland discloses the data object is
comprised of multiple elements, wherein the stored procedure (col 10, lines
45-48) output includes rows of data from at least one result se (tabular
result set, col 10, lines 60-62), wherein inserting the stored procedure
output into the data object further comprises inserting data from each
column in each row in each result set to one element in the data object (col
10, lines 14-20 and lines 60-62, and wherein the metadata defines structure
and types of data in each element (col 10, lines 14-20).

13.   As per claims 10, 24, and 38, Ireland discloses wherein the data object
is comprised of multiple elements (tabular result set, col 10, lines 60-67),
and wherein the stored procedure output is capable of including multiple
output parameters (col 10, lines 60-67), wherein inserting the stored
procedure output into the data object further comprises inserting each
output parameter into one element in the data object (col 10, lines 60-67),
and wherein the metadata provides information on structure and type of the
data in each element (col 10, lines 60-67 and col 4, lines19-23, JDBC allows
mappings from SQL types to Java types that can be used by the ResultSet
getter methods.) .

14.   As per claims 11, 25, and 39, Ireland discloses the client only receives

one data object with stored procedure output in response to the call (tabular

result set, col 10, lines 60-62).

15.   As per claims 13, 27, and 41, Ireland discloses a method, system, and

article of manufacture for making stored procedure programs available to

application programs, comprising:

determining one stored procedure program generating output needed

by one application program (col 10, lines 45-47 and lines 60-63, tabular

result set is an output);

generating a remote interface implementation to respond to a remote

interface method capable of receiving a call (220, fig 2) from the application

program (210, fig 2) including data and invoking a stored procedure in a

database server (230, fig 2) with the data from the application program

used as input (col 12, lines 29-61); and

generating an output mapping for the remote interface implementation

(tabular result set, col 10, lines 36-42) to use to determine how to insert the

stored procedure output into a data object that may be used by the

application program (col 8, lines 16-31 and col 10, lines 13-20).

16.   As per claims 14, 28 and 42, Ireland discloses the generated remote

interface implementation inserts metadata (col 10, lines 46-49) into the

data object providing information on the stored procedure output inserted

into the data object (col 10, lines 46-49 and lines 60-65).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

17.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis

for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not
> identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this
> title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be
> patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole
> would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a
> person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter
> pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which
> the invention was made.

18.   Claims 12, 26, and 40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Ireland et al. (6,266,666) (hereinafter Ireland) in view of

Clegg et al. (6,356,946) (hereinafter Clegg).

19.   As per claims 12, 26, and 40, Ireland discloses wherein the remote

interface implementation is implemented as a Enterprise JavaBean (211, fig

2, col9, lines 18-23). However, Ireland fails to disclose the data object

comprises a Java serializable object. Serialiazble object is well known in the

art, i.e, Ireland disclosure of serializing the output using Sybase Tabular

Data Stream. For example, Clegg discloses the data object comprises a Java

serializable object (col 4, lines 27-35). It would have been obvious to one of

ordinary skill in the art at the time invention was made to combine the

teaching of Ireland and Clegg because Clegg's use of Java object

serialization would provide Ireland's system methodology for streaming to

client objects stored and managed remotely, so that the objects may be

executed or manipulated locally at the clients.

Response to Arguments

20.   Applicant's arguments filed 01/25/2005 have been fully considered but

they are not persuasive, therefore rejections to claims 1-42 is maintained.

21.   In the remarks applicants argued that:

      A. Ireland does not disclose generating a stored procedure call

      with the accessed parameters.

      B. Ireland does not disclose transferring the stored procedure

      call to a stored procedure named by the call to execute.

C. Ireland does not disclose receiving output from the stored

procedure.

D. Ireland does not disclose inserting the received output from

the stored procedure into a data object.

E. Ireland does not disclose an input mapping to determine the

parameters.

F. Ireland does not disclose an output mapping indicating how

the stored procedure output is mapped to the data object.

22.   In response to applicant's argument A, examiner respectfully

disagrees, Ireland discloses generating a stored procedure call (col 9, lines

48-58 and col 10, lines 45-49, the client sends a query requesting list of

stored procedures to the Component Transaction Server and CTS generates

the stored procedure call by using MASP feature) with the accessed

parameters as input parameters (class ParamDef, col 11) of the stored

procedure (col 9, lines 48-67 and col 10, lines 45-49, Book store class have

a method get books by title and user entered parameters as explained in fig

4, and CTS invoke the stored procedure call as it is explained by Clegg,

generating stored procedure call, passing parameters as input parameter are

inherent in the context CTS).

23.   In response to applicant's argument B, examiner respectfully

disagrees, Ireland discloses transferring the stored procedure call to a stored

procedure named by the call to execute (col 9, lines 51-60, CTS in response

returns the list of stored procedures to the client, and col 10 lines 45-65

further explains how CTS, 221, fig2, transfer the stored procedure calls to

execute by using Methods as Stored Procedures, col 12, lines 20-25 and col

14, lines 45-51).

24.   In response to applicant's argument C, examiner respectfully

disagrees. Ireland discloses receiving output from the stored procedure

(output is tabular result set, 221, fig2, col 9, lines 47-51 and col 10, lines 1-

10).

25.   In response to applicant's argument D, examiner respectfully

disagrees. Ireland discloses inserting the received output from the stored

procedure into a data object (result set is an object, col 9, lines 47-51).

26.   In response to applicant's argument E, examiner respectfully

disagrees, Ireland discloses an input mapping (lookup in hash table, col 12,

lines 8-26, ParamDef encapsulates the meta data from the database, input

mapping is a feature of CTS 221, fig2) to determine the parameters (col 12,

lines 64-67 and col 13, lines 1-30) in the client call to use as input

parameters to the stored procedure call (col 16, lines 62-67, col 9, lines 48-

67 and col 10, lines 45-49, Book store class have a method get books by

title and user entered parameters as explained in fig 4, and CTS invoke the

stored procedure call as it is explained by Clegg, generating stored

procedure call, passing parameters as input parameter are inherent in the

context CTS 221, fig2).

27.   In response to applicant's argument F, examiner respectfully

disagrees. Ireland discloses processing an output mapping indicating how

the stored procedure output is mapped to the data object (tabular result set,

col 10, lines 36-42, fig 2, 221, 224, CTS).

Conclusion

28.   **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the

extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mohammad A. Siddiqi whose telephone number is (571) 272-3976. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday -Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John A. Follansbee can be reached on (571) 272-3964. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained

from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status

information for published applications may be obtained from either Private

PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is

available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on

access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center

(EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

MAS

JOHN FOLLANSBEE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100